

cc: Jim

XX July 5, 1974

Dear Harold (& Howard),

This is really me - my ~~xxx~~ typewriter broke down most inconveniently this afternoon. I will be ~~x~~ very brief, since it is nearly midnight and I want the enclosures to reach you on Monday.

I have received your letters of 6/29 (mailed 7/1) and 7/3 (both arrived today). Thank you for filling me in. Harold, I am generally reassured by your description of how the work is progressing.

Some of our apparent disagreement is due to the time and distance between us. It would maybe help if you did explain, as non-elliptically as possible, what you expect 'them' to do with this material. In the first part of my letter of 6/27 I ~~xxx~~ was raising the various approaches which the situation might demand, depending on the intended audience and your purposes. I assume you have ~~xxxxx~~ thought this through. If you have concluded that no attempt should be made to write an article until after your publication, I don't want ~~xxx~~ to argue about that, especially from here. I seem to disagree with you both about how much the transcript ~~xxxxx~~ speaks for itself, but now that you plan a fairly long ~~xxxxx~~ introduction I am not concerned that you ~~x~~ will not have the space for the necessary explanations. I don't think the issue is the intelligence or understanding of the non-expert reader, but his background knowledge and our writing ability.

Please review points (2) and (3) on p. 1 of my 6/27 letter. You haven't responded to the issues I raised there. Even if there were no time pressures, if I were compiling a 200-page book based on this transcript I would keep the documentation and discussion of the post-1/27 investigation ~~xxxxx~~ down to the minimum necessary to reinforce the impact of the transcript. Obviously my viewpoint is influenced by the work I have done on my manuscript. I spent a ~~x~~ great deal of time and effort gathering, organizing, and cutting down the material. I had to try to achieve a balance between an analytical and thematic approach, and a detailed analysis of all the documents. I suggested that you consider using my Chapter 3 in its present form if you feel it is necessary for your purposes to ~~xxxxx~~ go into the post-1/27 investigation in detail - what is your reaction to that? Also, I would be glad to give you all my material on the Hosty entry if you want to use my entire Chapter 5. But I really think you would be better off putting your effort into polishing your discussion of the 1/27 meeting, what led up to it, the immediate consequences (Hoover's 1/27 letter and the Jaworski turn-off of the Hudkins investigation), and your Russell story. I have deferred to you a couple of times on this business of the transcript, and unless you have ~~xxxxx~~ compelling reasons for going into peripheral matters such as the Hosty entry I hope you will find it possible to defer to my judgment.

Howard, thanks for your letter. The next-to-last thing I want to do is get into an argument with you, but please don't try to convince me that I don't appreciate the importance of this transcript. (The last thing I want to do is get into an argument with Harold!) If it now seems that you have the time to provide the necessary annotation of the last 30 pages (and the space), ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ fine. Certainly the section on the medical evidence is one of the juicy bits I would have suggested at least quoting in any case.

I'm still not clear about the actual or possible time constraints, but I hope that you will be able to send me what you write for comments - i.e., in case you do have a week or so when you might be able to make use of my suggestions.

I trust that my letter of 7/2 has reached you, with the enclosures in good shape.

(MORE)

7/5/74 to HW

I hope the enclosed 23 pages are also usable. They are the best copies I can get around here - over twice the usual cost (8¢/page). These items are:

- (1) CD 320, SS 767 (The ~~xx~~ SS Hudkins interview)
 - (2) CD 385, pp. 104-8. The other pages might be necessary to explain p. 106, the Hudkins interview; you could retype or summarize them.
 - (3) Tonahill's letter of Jan. 9 (9 pp.), two related routing slips, Hoover's letter to Tonahill (Jan. 14), and Hoover to the Commission (Jan. 14). You will probably want to use only part of the Tonahill letter (pp. 4-5) although the whole thing is fascinating. I don't have a better copy of the Hoover-Rankin letter, which is the important one; sorry. As for the substantive reply to Tonahill, I haven't found it yet (I only got the Tonahill letter in February), but according to Dorothy Kilgallen in the NY Journal-American (quoted in Joesten, pp. 134-5), the reply came from Jack Miller on Jan 28 and said that the material on Oswald was ~~xx~~ irrelevant and would not be made available, but the Ruby material would be. You could see if this is in the Tonahill name file in the Archives.
 - The ~~x~~ Tonahill letter is discussed on p. 3.19 of my manuscript.
 - (4) The ~~telegram from the Texans~~ telegram from the Texans on Jan 23.
 - (5) Hoover to Rankin, Jan 27. (see pp. 3.20-22 of my manuscript.)
- It is noteworthy that this letter is logged in as having been received on 1/28 - that is, for all we know he may have written it after having found out about the 1/27 meeting. Hoover certainly came down hard on Warren's approach!

My best to all,

Paul
PLH